

ne 1 48. The database system of claim 43 coupled to a routing system configured
2 to select an appropriate route for a selected one of the mobile units.

ne 1 49. The database system of claim 48 wherein the routing system utilizes
2 routes from a list comprising a fixed route, scheduled route, and optimized route.

ne 1 50. The database system of claim 48 wherein the selected route includes
2 street data from the vector information.

ne 1 51. The database system of claim 43 coupled to a dispatch management
2 system configured to manage the computer aided dispatching.

ne 1 52. The database system of claim 43 further including order data from
2 customers, the order data having a portion being transferred from a data acquisition device
3 coupled to a radio in one of the plurality of mobile units.

ne 1 53. The database system of claim 43 wherein each of the plurality of mobile
2 units comprises a navigation tracking device, the navigational tracking device including a
3 microprocessor operably coupled to a global positioning system (GPS) navigational sensor and
4 a mobile radio modem operably coupled to the microprocessor.

REMARKS

Claims 21-53 are pending in this application. Claims 43-53 were previously added through an amendment filed on August 14, 1998, as evidenced by a copy of the Express Mail receipt and stamped postcard, submitted herewith. A copy of the preliminary amendment has also been enclosed for ease of reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request examination of claims 43-53, as filed.

Claims 25, 26, 41, 46, and 47 have been amended hereby. No new matter is introduced thereby.

Claims 25, 26, 41, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. In response, Applicants have amended claims 25, 26, and 41 as

detailed above. Claim 25 and 26 have been amended to recite language regarding a "monitoring system" which provides information regarding the "database system." In claim 41, all occurrences of "operable" have been replaced with "operably." Accordingly, these claims should now be allowable. Claims 42 depends on claim 41 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons. Also, claims 46 and 47 have been amended in a similar fashion as claims 25 and 26, respectively.

Claims 21-42 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over at least claims 6 and 19 of U.S. Patent No. 5,428,546, claims 1 and 13 of U.S. Patent No. 5,636,122, and claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,594,650. Applicants are prepared to submit a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome these rejections. But, Applicants would like to first overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and review results of examination of claims 43-53.

Furthermore, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the note regarding the incorrect continuing data shown on the filing receipt. Applicants have already received a corrected filing receipt on January 6, 1999, listing the correct continuing data.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at (650) 326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Ramin Aghevli
Reg. No. P43,462

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
(650) 326-2400 / Fax: (650) 326-2422
RTO:RA:tff